DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 683 HE 021 696

TITLE COPA Self-Study Advisory Panel. Findings and Recommendations Submitted to the Board of Directors, The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
INSTITUTION Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 2 Oct 86
NOTE 51p.
AVAILABLE FROM Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 305, Washington, DC 20036 (available for cost of duplicating).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); Educational Assessment; *Educational Quality; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; Institutional Role; *Policy Formation; Position Papers; Public Policy; *Self Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS *Council on Postsecondary Accreditation; Self Regulation (Groups)

ABSTRACT

The final report from the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation's (COPA) Self-Study Advisory Panel on its review of COPA's objectives, priorities, governance, and financing is presented. Following a letter from the Chairman of the self-study advisory panel, a panel membership list, and a charge to the panel and overview of the study, six chapters look at the following: (1) the system of accreditation; (2) COPA objectives; (3) priority issues; (4) governance and structure (the board, board committees, and assemblies); (5) finance; and (6) a postscript for the future. Twenty-one recommendations are listed that suggest the role and mission of COPA must change to focus increasingly on stimulating dialogue and providing the kind of leadership that can make accreditation a positive instrument for assuring the quality education essential to the future of the United States. Seven appendices cover: persons submitting written testimony; summary of written testimony; speakers list: oral testimony; summary of oral testimony; research and development (R&D) in accreditation (background for Recommendation 8), which calls for enhanced R&D efforts related to national issues; suggested changes in Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (general, executive committee, nominating committee, committee on professional development, and committee on state relations); and a glossary of acronyms. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297683

COPA SELF-STUDY ADVISORY PANEL

Findings & Recommendations

submitted to

The Board of Directors

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

October 2, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

COPA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 021 696

October 2, 1986

Dr. Ellis McCune
Chair
Council on Postsecondary Accreditation
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 305
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Chairman McCune:

On behalf of the Self-Study Advisory Panel to the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, I am pleased to submit our final report. The members of the Panel met in three sessions and carried out special assignments before and between meetings. The work of the Panel was facilitated by background materials assembled and prepared beforehand.

At its meeting on June 30 and July 1 and 2, the Panel heard oral testimony from 10 persons representing the academic and accrediting communities and state and local governments. In addition, it received written reports and comments from 20 different organizations and individuals.

The Panel has been concerned not only with the specific charge to review the objectives, priorities, governance and financing of the Council but also with the larger context of higher and postsecondary education, of which accreditation is an essential part. The Panel is particularly concerned with the role that accreditation should play in focussing academic concern on achieving quality educational programs that serve the interest of our students while strengthening the ability of our nation to compete effectively in a difficult and changing world. Thus, in addition to specific recommendations to the Council, the report also includes general recommendations to all who do or should participate in the self-regulatory accrediting system of postsecondary education in this country.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the hard working members of the Panel and to all those who provided information and suggestions to the Panel during its deliberations.

Cordially,

C. Peter Magrath
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal i

Table of Contents ii

Panel Membership iii

Charge to the Panel and Overview of the Study v

I. The System of Accreditation 1

II. Objectives of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation . . . 6

III. Priority Issues 9

IV. Governance and Structure 13
The Board 13
Board Committees 15
Assemblies 16

V. Finance 20

VI. A Postscript for the Future 22

Appendices 24

I. Persons Submitting Written Testimony 25

II. Summary of Written Testimony 26

III. Speakers List: Oral Testimony 29

IV. Summary of Oral Testimony 30

V. Research and Development in Accreditation (Background for Recommendation 8) 35

VI. Suggested Changes in Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws 37

A. General 37
B. Executive Committee 38
C. Nominating Committee 39
D. Committee on Professional Development 40
E. Committee on State Relations 41

VII. Glossary of Acronyms 42

PANEL MEMBERSHIP

Dr. C. Peter Magrath - Chair
President
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65211

Dr. Paul Albrecht
Executive Vice President and Dean
Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, California 91711

Dr. E.K. Fretwell, Jr.
Chancellor
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Charlotte, North Carolina 28223

Ann Ida Gannon, BDM
Mundelein College
6363 Sheridan Road
Chicago, Illinois 60660

Dr. Robert Glidden
Dean, School of Music
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dr. John Rhodes Haverty
Dean, College of Health Sciences
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Paul C. Reinert, SJ
Chancellor
St. Louis University
221 N. Grand Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63103

Dr. Arliss Roaden
Executive Director
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
501 Union Building #300
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Dr. Robert W. Scott
President
State Department of Community Colleges
194 Education Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

Ex Officio members of the panel are:

Dr. Ellis McCune (Chairman of the Board)
President
California State University-Hayward
25800 Hillary Street
Hayward, California 94542

Dr. Richard M. Millard
President
Council on Postsecondary Accreditation
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 305
Washington, D.C. 20036

Consultant members of the panel are:

Dr. Donald H. Driemeier
Dean, School of Business
University of Missouri
8001 Natural Bridge
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Mrs. Mary Louise Petersen
Former Chair
Iowa Board of Regents
1411 10th Street
Harlan, Iowa 51537

CHARGE TO THE PANEL AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

In October of 1981 the Board of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation received and acted upon the report of a special Self-Study Advisory Panel. The Board adopted the objectives, most of the structure and the priorities recommended by the panel and revised the bylaws to reflect these recommendations in April of 1982. It is these objectives, structures and priorities the Council has been operating under since July of 1982. Among the recommendations adopted by the Board was that the objectives, structures, financing and priorities be reviewed at least every five years.

To this end, at its meeting in Denver on October 11, 1985 the COPA Board determined that a new Self-Study Advisory Panel would be formed to conduct the self-study between April and October, 1986 and to report to the Board at its Fall meeting. The charge to the Self-Study Advisory Panel was as follows:

1. To review and assess the objectives of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation in terms of their adequacy and relevance to current and anticipated conditions in postsecondary education and accreditation;

2. To review and assess the extent to which the governance, structure and operations of the Council have enabled it to meet its objectives and are conducive to its continuing to do so;

3. To review and assess the current financing of the Council in terms of its adequacy to enable the Council to achieve its objectives;

4. To review and assess the priorities of the Council in light of its objectives and suggest additional issues for priority consideration; and

5. To submit a report and make appropriate recommendations in each of the above areas to the Assemblies and the Board in October of 1986.

At the same meeting, the Executive Committee was charged with appointing the Self-Study Advisory Panel. Immediately following the October Board meeting a request went to all COPA constituencies for nominations of persons for membership on the Panel. Some 56 persons were nominated. The Executive Committee met in Chicago on December 11 to review the nominations and select the Panel members. With the exception of two persons who were to be out of the country during the period of the review, all the committee's first choices accepted appointment to the Panel. At the same meeting the Executive Committee accepted a general work plan for the study.

The work plan called for an initial two-day meeting of the Panel in May 1986 to review the charge and identify major issues and concerns to be addressed. A second more extended meeting with public hearings would be held in late June or early July and a final meeting for completing the report would be held in mid August. All three meetings would be held in Washington.

The first meeting was held on May 27 and 28. In preparation for the Panel meeting background materials were prepared that included the following:

1. Historical background
2. Activities as related to priorities: 1982-1986
3. Goals, objectives, and work responsibilities related to budget: 1984-85
4. Governance and finance including historical developments: 1975-1981
5. Policy development: 1981-1986
6. Structure, role and activities of the Recognition Committee: 1982-1986
7. Assemblies and their activities: 1982-1986
8. Professional development program
9. Publications and Public Affairs
10. Funded projects
11. State and federal relations: 1982-1986

The first meeting was spent identifying issues to be addressed in the light of the four aspects of the charge. The Panel developed a list of policy issues and structural issues to be addressed. The former involved the relation of COPA and accreditation to the larger community. The latter involved adequacy and/or need for change in current COPA structure in terms of its ability to deal effectively with the former. During the first meeting the members of the Executive Committee met with the Panel to take part in Panel orientation. At the request of the Panel the members of the Executive Committee agreed to continue as consultant members to the Panel at subsequent meetings.

The second meeting was held on June 30 and July 1 and 2. Prior to the meeting written testimony had been received from some 20 persons and organizations relating to the four areas of the charge. The members of the Panel had an opportunity to review the written materials beforehand as well as at the meeting. Monday afternoon June 30 was devoted to hearings at which 10 persons presented a wide range of testimony. These included representatives of institutional and specialized accrediting bodies, national higher education organizations, the United States Department of Education and state higher education agencies.

During the three days of deliberations, part of which were spent in subgroups, the Panel considered the various reports, background materials and testimony and was able to approach consensus on (1) the need for placing any recommendations within the context of current national concern with postsecondary educational quality, (2) modifications in COPA statements of purpose and objectives, (3) reassessment and restatement of COPA priorities, (4) possible modifications in COPA governance, and (5) reassessment of COPA's financial base. It was agreed that a draft report with recommendations would be prepared and distributed to the Panel members prior to the next meeting.

Review, revision and modification of the draft report constituted the primary agenda at the August 18-19 meeting. In addition, an informal discussion session was held on the morning of August 18 with the staff executives of the national higher education organizations currently members of the Assembly of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations about the particular problems and proposed recommendations related to that Assembly.

By the end of the meeting the substance of what would constitute a final report was agreed upon. A draft of the final report was subsequently prepared, circulated to the members of the Panel, and then further revised. What follows constitutes the final report and is incorporated in the Board Agenda Book for the meetings of the Assemblies and the Board on October 2 and 3, 1986. Under the able chairmanship of Dr. C. Peter Magrath, the hard working Advisory Panel has been able to complete its assignment and present its report to the Assemblies and Board as scheduled.

I. THE SYSTEM OF ACCREDITATION

Preamble and General Recommendations

The basic system of accreditation in American higher education is alive and working--and in most cases working better than it did in the previous decade. The structural reorganization that led to the creation of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) and the accompanying changes in the general accreditation community during the past ten years have served well the only interest that should be paramount in accreditation--our nation's interest in high quality education. This report builds upon the guidelines and accomplishments stimulated by our predecessors' study, Final Report of the 1981 Self-Study Advisory Panel, and the excellent 1986 statement, Educational Quality and Accreditation, produced by COPA.

Nevertheless, while we recommend a number of relatively modest structural changes in the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, we are convinced that there is an urgent need for all participants in the process of accreditation--accrediting agencies, colleges and universities, national higher education associations, and the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation itself--to address not so much the letter but the spirit, and the future, of the total accreditation system. There is today constructive ferment in American higher education, much of it understandably focused on undergraduate programs, and the system of accreditation can--and should--play a major role in addressing the issues involved.

We stress what is perhaps obvious but too often neglected: accreditation, whether of a particular professional program or of an entire college or university, is a means, not an end. The end must be the nurturing and the development of high quality educational programs--not just adequate programs that meet minimal standards. The goal of accreditation in education is to promote programs and institutions that are excellent and that demonstrate in their actual performance the highest possible quality, whether measured in terms of the learning of individual students, the significance of the research efforts, or the value of the educational service that has been provided. Measured against this goal, we believe that accreditation in America in 1986 falls short of providing the quality assurance that our nation deserves from our private and public colleges and universities as we look to the Twenty-First Century, and that our civic and political leaders increasingly, and correctly, demand.

We believe that there are many ways in which the accreditation system can be improved. Such improvements depend far more upon motivation and attitudinal commitments among the key participants in the accreditation and higher education community than they do on structural changes in the machinery of accreditation. We believe, also, that all of us concerned with improving American higher education and furthering the push for higher quality must candidly acknowledge this fact of educational life: a significant number of

perceptive and interested observers look critically upon many aspects of the accreditation system and the quality of much of the teaching and learning done in our classrooms. We note the most significant of these criticisms, not to finger point or assign blame, but to emphasize that there is a major challenge before the house of higher education. All of us in higher education have work to do--if we are committed to improving quality in postsecondary education.

Without listing all of the possible criticisms and reservations about accreditation and its relationship to higher education, we note that there are some issues that clearly warrant attention. Many close observers of the educational scene--ourselves included--believe that far too often the participants in the accreditation process focus their efforts on minimal, barely adequate, standards. These, moreover, are often imposed in a highly technical and bureaucratic fashion, without addresssing the challenge of promoting improved standards in our teaching and learning programs. Put another way, the value of getting a program or a college "accredited" is seen as a useful and important license that serves the perhaps narrower interest of the licensor and the licensee without sufficient regard to the interests of the ultimate licensee--the United States and its public interest in quality higher education.

We believe, in short, that at least four general criticisms are valid. The first is that too often accreditation is based on minimal statistical standards without an insistence on higher quality in the process of teaching and learning and general education. For the competitive years ahead, accreditation grades of "D" and "C," whether for an entire college or a program within it, should be viewed as inadequate. Our accreditation standards should set their sights unequivocally on the pursuit of "B's" and "A's"!

Second, it is often said, and unfortunately at times with justification, that accreditation, particularly by representatives of specialized professional and occupational programs, is self-serving. Either the specialized accrediting body is perceived as promoting a self-protective system to control a market in one way or another, or it is believed that the specialized programs in our nation's colleges and universities are in league with their professional colleagues from the national profession in a back-scratching kind of relationship.

Third, accrediting at times focuses too narrowly on a particular program without due regard of the total educational context and mission of the college or university.

Equally true--and this is our fourth concern--too many college and university presidents have ignored the process and the potential of accreditation. For whatever reasons, they have found other priorities more compelling for their personal and institutional agendas. To the extent that this particular criticism is valid, it is consistent with recent findings that relatively few college and university presidents directly involve themselves with educational issues. Might not a wholesome interest in accreditation, both nationally and for their particular colleges and universities, provide a marvelous vehicle to reverse this sorry state of affairs?

We do not list these criticisms and concerns, and surely any perceptive observer could add to the list, either to assign blame or to assess in depth the validity of these criticisms. The blunt fact is that these kinds of criticisms are stated, often privately and quietly, though at times more publicly by critics of higher education, by state legislators and governors, and by national leaders. Moreover, even if the critique is unjustified, the further fact remains that those of us truly dedicated to the highest quality system of American higher education have a vested interest in reinvigorating the accreditation process so that it serves the ultimate ends that should unite us all: quality educational programs that serve the interests of our students while strengthening the ability of our nation to compete effectively in a tough world.

We therefore believe that the significant agenda for all participants in the accreditation process is as simple and direct as it is challenging and demanding of our highest personal and institutional commitment: a commitment to making the accreditation process a vehicle for achieving higher quality in all higher education programs; a commitment to having that process, both in fact and in perception, serve our nations's interest; and a commitment to moving beyond some of the parochial and narrow practices of the past that have infected--and debilitated--us all. In short, we challenge both ourselves as individuals, and all others who are involved in higher education, including our public officials, to work together in developing a new vision for accreditation as a vehicle for the improvement of high quality education. None of this, of course, will happen unless there is both a renewed and more focused vision and a commitment to strategies that bring us together on behalf of the public interest in high quality education in our public and private colleges and universities. Such a commitment, we note, is consistent with our national aspirations and with our ideal of access and educational opportunity for all Americans regardless of social, economic or ethnic backgrounds.

The ultimate recommendation we make, therefore, is attitudinal, not mechanistic or structural. We ask that all accrediting bodies and institutions put at the top of their agenda the question, not of how we maintain merely adequate standards in educational programs, but how we elevate those standards on the premise that "adequate" or "satisfactory" or "passing" may once have been good enough--but are not good enough for the next century.

We ask the presidents of our private and public educational institutions, whatever their size and mission, to address themselves single-mindedly to the proposition that all accreditation outcomes should be premised on the general public good, not the narrower interest of the accrediting body, the academic program, or the college or university itself. We similarly ask that all accrediting bodies, and the professional men and women who lead them, think of themselves first and foremost as educators, committed to tough-minded standards for the assessment and measurement of quality in the programs that they canvass. And we ask also that these accreditor educators approach their important and delicate assignments with the attitude of helping a program and a college or a university to do more; to be better; and to achieve its full potential.

At the same time, we insist that all accreditation should focus on the general, not the narrow, good. The more specialized or professional accrediting bodies should dedicate, or rededicate, themselves to furthering the general public good by a sensitive understanding and appreciation that a particular professional or specialized program is a program within a college or university whose total educational mission and health ought to be as much a focus of the accreditors' concern as the quality and health of the particular program under examination. Any program in any college or university sooner or later--and we believe sooner--has to be seen in the context of the total mission of the college or university and with a due regard for other appropriate educational missions being served by the institution.

We believe, also, that college and university presidents must be encouraged, indeed recruited, to play more direct and active roles in the accreditation community, along with academic vice presidents, deans, and faculty. There are always a hundred and one reasons why all of us are too busy. But if the will and the interest are there, we believe that more college and university presidents can be encouraged to participate as generalists not only on accreditation teams, but in leadership positions in our nation's specialized, regional, and national accrediting bodies. There are of course many other critical participants in the quest for an improved system of higher education, and these concerned and committed participants, such as our nation's higher education coordinating officers organized through the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), our educationally concerned legislators and governors organized through the Education Commission of the States (ECS) and the National Governors Association (NGA), and the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) must be encouraged to participate positively in examining questions of accreditation and educational quality. And just as significantly, we believe that the nation's higher education associations, currently organized through one of the three assemblies of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, must be encouraged, indeed urged, to participate, along with their institutions and presidents, even more actively than has been the case up until now.

The architecture of our report is built on the assumption that our views on the challenge of accreditation in higher education are far more important than the structural changes and amendments we propose. We specifically urge that, just as soon as possible, a major and inclusive conference on accreditation and quality in higher education be convened under the auspices of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the American Council on Education and other key participants in the accreditation community. Such a conference should be constructed so as to be practical and specific. It should address the real questions before the national house of higher education, questions that are legitimately of concern to our elected, governmental, and civic leaders. It should, moreover, be organized around the fundamental assumption that accreditation is not a cookbook mechanical process on "how to get certified," but an educational vehicle to further the highest possible quality in all of the programs of our colleges and universities.

Before we turn now to our comments and specific recommendations to COPA for structural and mechanical improvements, the thrust of our report would be lost if we did not reaffirm our emphatic judgment about the key challenges before all of us involved in postsecondary education. These challenges, we believe, are ones of attitude, shared commitment, and a focus on making accreditation a synonym not for academic "certification" and therefore for survival, but a synonym for exciting education that develops the full potential of our students.

Accordingly, we first propose these general recommendations to all who participate in the system of accreditation and higher education:

- *A fundamental purpose of accreditation should be recognized to be this: to focus on the educational values of the institution or program in order to elevate its standards and quality without being trapped into a narrow counting of minimal standards measured by mundane statistics.*

- *The processes of accreditation should deemphasize narrow technical standards, whether in a specific program or an entire college or university, and instead emphasize the pursuit of educational standards and outcomes of the highest possible quality appropriate to the extraordinarily competitive world that the United States now faces.*

- *The presidents of our nation's colleges and universities should become more directly involved in accreditation, viewing it as a vehicle for the furtherance of their educational obligations and aspirations.*

- *The accreditors should view themselves first and foremost as educators, significant partners in the process of teaching and learning dedicated to improving standards relevant to the mission of the college, university, and programs which they assess.*

- *The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the American Council on Education, and other key participants in the accreditation community should convene, as quickly as conveniently possible, a major and inclusive national conference on accreditation and quality in higher education.*

II. PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

In 1981, the Advisory Panel proposed purposes and objectives which were "directly related to the nature and function of accreditation in the American postsecondary education scene and to the leadership role which COPA should perform as the national coordinating and monitoring organization for accreditation." The general statement of purpose and three major objectives were adopted by the Board and currently appear in COPA's Articles of Incorporation and various publications, including The Balance Wheel for Accreditation.

The Advisory Panel has reaffirmed many of the philosophical bases and much of the functional content of the purposes and objectives offered by its predecessor in 1981, with some alteration in emphasis.

The objectives currently number three, focusing on the provision of (1) the recognition function, (2) national leadership and (3) services to accrediting bodies, postsecondary educational institutions and the public. The Advisory Panel reaffirms these and adds a fourth, to appear as the premier objective: COPA's role in improving the quality of postsecondary education.

Although educational quality is a recurring theme on a national scale in recent months, accreditation has, since its inception, represented the academic community's primary means of self-regulation and quality assessment as an important means to quality enhancement. COPA thus has responsibilities to accrediting associations, students, institutions, programs and the public to improve the quality of postsecondary education. A primary objective in this vein is the recognition process, or the monitoring of the accrediting process as it is carried out by the voluntary accrediting associations, assuring students and the public that it is conducted effectively and responsibly.

Closely related to the enhancement of educational quality is COPA's national leadership for postsecondary accreditation. As an official voice for accreditation at a national and state level, COPA has a major responsibility for helping to create an awareness of the role and value of accreditation among institutions, faculties, governing boards, state and federal governments and the general public in developing understanding and support for the accrediting process. Further, COPA has a major responsibility to develop relationships with and, where appropriate, to cooperate with and urge cooperation among educational leaders, institutions or programs and federal and state agencies in strengthening the role of accreditation.

Finally, COPA is a service organization. It provides a series of services to accrediting bodies, educational institutions and programs and to the public, including: quality improvement assistance, help in the development of national accreditation policy, research activities, professional development programming, the monitoring of governmental activities and publications.

With these factors in mind, the Advisory Panel's recommendations reaffirm with modifications where appropriate the following statements of purposes and objectives:

Recommendation 1. *Purposes:*

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) is a nongovernmental organization that works to foster and facilitate the role of accrediting bodies in promoting and insuring the quality and diversity of American postsecondary education. The accrediting bodies, while established and supported by their membership, are intended to serve the broader interests of society as well. To promote these ends, we reaffirm the role of COPA in recognizing, coordinating and periodically reviewing the work of its member accrediting bodies, and the appropriateness of existing or proposed accrediting bodies and their activities, through its granting of recognition and performance of other related functions.

Recommendation 2. *Objectives:*

COPA seeks to accomplish the following major objectives:

1. *Promote, improve, and assure the quality of postsecondary education in the United States.*

2. *Recognize accrediting bodies that accredit institutions and programs of postsecondary education on the basis of demonstrated need and specified standards related to accrediting policies and practices.*

3. *Provide national leadership for postsecondary accreditation and the enhancement of educational quality by:*

    - *Cultivating an understanding of the role, nature and significance of accreditation,*
    - *Serving as an official voice at national and state levels for accreditation,*
    - *Initiating conferences and activities for the purposes of improving the process of assessment, and*
    - *Promoting active collaboration and/or interaction among educational leaders, institutions/programs and federal and state agencies.*

4. *Provide services by:*

    - *Assisting institutions, programs and accrediting bodies to improve accrediting processes, policies and practices,*
    - *Coordinating the professional development of the membership and interested parties,*

- *Providing a forum and vehicle for discussion and development of national accreditation policy,*

- *Facilitating coordination among accrediting bodies,*

- *Encouraging, sponsoring, conducting and publishing research relating to the understanding and improvement of accreditation,*

- *Monitoring federal and state activities related to accreditation and informing the accrediting community, and*

- *Publishing annual lists of recognized accrediting bodies and the institutions and programs which they accredit and publishing research findings and other information on accreditation.*

III. PRIORITY ISSUES

Written and oral testimony presented by the various constituencies of accreditation, combined with current literature and perspectives concerning the general environment of postsecondary education, generated issues with which COPA should be concerning itself. Considering these, the Advisory Panel identified key priorities for COPA's work and recommended vehicles for their implementation.

The Panel recognizes that priorities should be constantly reviewed as circumstances change and that the priorities identified should be used as guidelines subject to change, and not as fixed concerns. In this sense the recommendations of the Advisory Panel on priorities differ from the recommendations on objectives, governance and finance in that they underline desirable emphases rather than constitute a specific set of actions that should be taken.

With these factors in mind the Advisory Panel calls attention to the following priority issues:

Recommendation 3. *Improve the quality of postsecondary education by acting as a catalyst for quality improvement.*

This priority is anchored in the understanding that American postsecondary education, including its forms and users, is diversified and that quality is relative to the specific nature of the entity being evaluated. In this vein, the Advisory Panel urges COPA to:

- Initiate a national conference and/or a series of meetings focussed on issues of quality improvement, involving or sponsored by such governmental and independent groups as the Education Commission of the States, the State Higher Education Executive Officers and the American Council on Education.

- Encourage consideration and development of national indicators of educational quality as relevant to institutional accreditation through continuing research, review by institutional accrediting bodies and discussion at the national conference and other appropriate forums.

- Promote discussion and action on issues of concern such as the liberal content of professional education and balancing of professional studies and the liberal arts.

Recommendation 4. *Strengthen relations with the States.*

In light of increasing State involvement in issues of quality assessment, accountability, and oversight the accrediting community should give high priority attention to state relations. In this vein, COPA and its accrediting bodies are encouraged to:

- Strengthen the role of the existing Council on Postsecondary Accreditation/State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) Liaison Committee (see Recommendation 14);

- Develop linkages with such state bodies as the Education Commission of the States, the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislators, the Southern Regional Education Board, the New England Board of Higher Education, and the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education;

- Consider closer ties with the States in coordinating institutional and specialized accrediting activities; and

- Continue collaborating on issues of mutual interest, including but not limited to assessment measures, long distance learning and diploma mills.

Recommendation 5. *Encourage and promote more direct institutional involvement in the accrediting process, particularly by presidents and academic officers.*

It is unclear to what extent institutional and program officials understand the role and are adequately involved in the process of accreditation. In order to promote greater involvement:

- Accrediting bodies are encouraged to involve presidents on visiting teams and accrediting commissions; and

- COPA is encouraged to promote involvement by strengthening its avenues of communication with institutions and by appointing presidents to appropriate COPA governance units, task forces and standing committees.

Recommendation 6. *Improve the quality assessment and enhancement processes.*

Through such internal vehicles as professional development programs, liaison committees and task forces, and through the application of the principles guiding the recognition process, COPA should improve the purposes and processes of accreditation by:

- Promoting accreditation as a vehicle to encourage institutional integrity;

- Encouraging appropriate rigor in the evaluative process so as to increase public awareness and respect for the role of accreditation;

- Encouraging the elevation of accreditation from being defined as meeting minimal standards to encouragement of excellence;

- Similarly, heightening the expectations accrediting bodies have in relation to the recognition process;

- Encouraging accrediting bodies to emphasize the enhancement aspect of the accrediting process;

- Improving educational information storage and retrieval by improving access and updating the data base;

- Continuing to encourage accrediting bodies to adopt standards which are defined in terms of educational outcomes;

- Promoting the philosophy that, in order for self-regulation to work best, it needs to be inclusive in terms of who is involved; and

- Emphasizing that for the accrediting process to have maximum effectiveness, it must be an integral part of the program or institution's ongoing evaluative and planning processes.

Recommendation 7. *Encourage and promote increased sensitivity on the part of accrediting bodies, institutions and programs to the importance of assessing the impact of changing student clienteles on institutional and program missions, objectives and structures.*

It is not clear that adequate attention in considering institution or program effectiveness is being paid to the major increase in part-time and older students and the growing demand for professional and personal renewal. These students are present in varying degrees both in regular and in continuing education programs. Sufficient attention is not being paid to the fact that the increasing percentage of minorities in the general population is not reflected in the percentage of minorities attending postsecondary institutions. In order to promote more adequate and ongoing consideration of these issues:

- Accrediting bodies are encouraged to review and modify, as appropriate, standards relative to part-time students, adult and continuing education, and continuing education as a part of professional and personal renewal.

- Accrediting bodies are encouraged to insure that provisions for access to postsecondary education are not overlooked in the concern for quality improvement.

- Accrediting bodies are encouraged to include where appropriate persons knowledgeable in continuing education on visiting teams.

- COPA is encouraged to develop effective liaison between accrediting bodies and appropriate national organizations concerned with adult, part-time and continuing education to promote ongoing concern with the quality of such education.

- Consideration of the needs related to part-time students, continuing education, equity and access should be included on the agenda for any national conference on quality improvement sponsored by COPA and other national organizations.

Recommendation 8. *Enhance research and development efforts as they relate to accreditation issues of national significance.*

Matters of national significance which affect the nature of accreditation and its processes often require timely and current consideration and information collection in order that the total community affected by an issue (e.g., the role of outcomes measurement in accreditation) can be informed in a timely manner. To this end, COPA and its constituency are encouraged to:

- Identify issues of national significance affecting the nature of accreditation and its processes;
- Appoint task forces charged with considering issues in depth and reporting out in a brief period of time; and
- Disseminate the work of the task forces to appropriate parties.

(Please refer to the Appendix V for a detailed description of this research and development priority.)

IV. GOVERNANCE AND STRUCTURE

The Council was extensively restructured as a result of the report of the 1981 Self Study Advisory Panel. The current Self Study Advisory Panel believes that the changes made at that time have on the whole been beneficial and have made possible considerable progress by the Council over the past five years. This is evident not only from the record but from both oral and written testimony. Thus the Advisory Panel does not recommend a radical restructuring of the Council at this time.

There are, however, certain persistent problems in structure that need to be addressed and for which the Panel recommends changes or modifications. There are other items which might be described as continuing concerns which should be noted but that in the opinion of the Panel do not call for changes at this point. A number of what appear to be governance problems seem in fact to be attitudinal rather than structural. However, these must also be addressed.

The major areas of concern include the following:

- Representation on the Board and its committees;
- Adequacy of the current committee structure;
- Presidential involvement in accreditation in general and the Council in particular; and
- Assembly organization and effectiveness:
  a. Provision for meetings of subgroups with common and/or unique concerns within assemblies or across assemblies;
  b. Nonparallel character of the Assembly of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations (ANPEO) and how it can most effectively be constructed and utilized; and
  c. Effective communication among assemblies and of assemblies with the Board.

The Board

The current structure of the Board has a number of advantages. These include the following:

- It is large enough to represent the major academic, professional and public participants in the accrediting process but small enough to be workable as a committee of the whole without direct participation of specific interest groups.
- Because the members are elected by major segments of the community (the Assemblies) and not by specific organizations, they are able to participate in actions as Board members rather than as pledged delegates.

- Since all members of the Board except the public and ex officio members must hold responsible positions in accredited academic institutions, the character of the Board as representing the academic community is assured.

- Through the presence of the chairs of the three Assemblies on the Board, as well as the members of the Board directly elected by each Assembly, the Assemblies are assured that their concerns are communicated and seriously considered by the Board.

- The current structure assures effective representation of chief executive officers not only through election of representatives by ANPEO but also by the inclusion of the three chief executive officers elected at large. In addition, usually at least one president is elected as a representative of the Assembly of Institutional Accrediting Bodies.

While cognizant of the concern of the National Institutional Accrediting Bodies that as a minority in the Assembly of Institutional Accrediting Bodies (AIAB), the probability of election of a representative from that group to the Board by AIAB may be low, the Advisory Panel believes that designating specific or individual representative positions on the Board could lead to Board fragmentation. However, it would urge future nominating committees to give particular attention to including a president from a nationally institutionally accredited institution among the chief executive officers elected at large. This is in the spirit of the 1981 report, which suggested that one of the functions of the category of chief executive officers elected at large was to enable the Board to balance itself. The Panel would suggest that AIAB should consider balance in its representation on the Board. It would also urge the national institutional accrediting bodies to insure that appropriate persons from their institutions are brought to the attention of AIAB and are forwarded to the nominating committee for its consideration.

While the Advisory Panel does not propose any major changes in Board structure, it does recommend the following:

Recommendation 9. *To insure continuing presidential involvement, the panel recommends that the provision for three at-large members of the Board nominated by the Assemblies being "chief executive or chief academic officers" be changed to include only "chief executive officers."* It should be noted that in practice one or more members elected by AIAB to the Board is usually a current or past college president. Thus presidents in fact constitute a majority of the elected members of the Board. (See Appendix VI A)

Recommendation 10. *The ex officio members who currently are restricted to voting only on election of Board members should be given the right to vote on all matters before the Board (exception to this is the president of COPA).* (See Appendix VI A)

Board Committees:

The Panel reviewed the committee structure in terms of current practices and commitments and of future needs to carry out proposed objectives and priorities. As a result, the Panel proposes changing somewhat the makeup of the Executive Committee, formalizing the Professional Development Committee and the COPA-SHEEO Liaison Committee, establishing the Nominating Committee as a Standing Committee, and eliminating the Committee on the Public Interest. Proposed bylaw modifications reflecting these changes are provided in Appendix VI A.

With regard to the Recognition Committee, the Panel recognizes the desirability of having persons with presidential experience as members. However, it does not believe that a bylaw change is either necessary or called for since two members of the Recognition Committee must represent ANPEO and these are nominated by that Assembly. Accordingly, the Panel urges ANPEO to nominate persons with presidential experience for membership on the Recognition Committee.

Recommendation 11. Executive Committee: *The Executive Committee should be increased from four voting and one ex officio members to five voting and one ex officio members.*

The members of the Committee should include as at present the four officers of the Board and the secretary (who is President of the Council) plus one member from the Board elected by the Board for a two year term. This person should be elected on nomination by the Nominating Committee in the same year as the Chairman of the Recognition Committee is elected. The current Executive Committee concurs with this recommendation. This change would both increase the scope of the Committee and facilitate ease of meeting by providing a working quorum in case all members could not be present. It is suggested that at least two members of the Executive Committee be institutional chief executive officers. (See Appendix VI B.)

Recommendation 12. Nominating Committee: *The Panel recommends that the Nominating Committee be made a standing committee and that the bylaws be modified to reflect this.*

Currently the Nominating Committee is in effect an ad hoc committee appointed each year. The standing committee should include at least three persons appointed by the Chair of the Board. The Chair of the Nominating Committee shall be a member of the Board. Other members may be selected from outside Board membership. (See Appendix VI C.)

Recommendation 13. Professional Development Committee: *The Panel recommends that the Committee on Professional Development should be made a standing committee of the Council.*

This Committee should become a standing committee as evidence of commitment to the priority to provide professional services, to contribute to the professional development of accrediting body staff members and in keeping with the commitment of assisting in the improvement of the accrediting process.

The Committee shall consist of six members appointed by the Chair of the Board, two of whom shall be the vice chairs of AIAB and ASAB and who shall alternate as chairs of the committee. The other four members shall be appointed for two year terms. (See Appendix VI D.)

Recommendation 14. Committee on State Relations: *The Panel strongly recommends that steps be taken to constitute the current COPA/SHEEO Liaison Committee into a standing committee of both organizations. To accomplish this the Panel recommends that COPA establish a Standing Committee on State Relations to consist of five persons with staggered two-year terms authorized to meet separately if need be but also designated as the COPA half of a COPA/SHEEO Liaison Committee.*

The Panel noted positive outcomes which have been developed through COPA and state governmental relations initiatives. Activities with organizations of state officers, state regulatory agencies, and consultation with individual states have led to improved communication between the states and COPA. In order to reaffirm these relationships, recognize growing influence of the states in the improvement of quality of postsecondary education, and further strengthen the linkage between COPA and the states, a standing committee on State Relations should be established which would serve as the COPA half of a permanent COPA/SHEEO Liaison Committee. This committee would also have responsibility for helping to formulate COPA policy as it relates to states and to state agencies. COPA would encourage SHEEO to form a similar Committee on Accreditation. Together they would constitute the COPA/SHEEO Liaison Committee with the chair to be drawn from SHEEO and COPA in alternate years. In addition the Panel encourages COPA to include representatives of the states on any appropriate task force or ad hoc committee. (See Appendix VI E.)

Recommendation 15: Committee on the Public Interest: *The Advisory Panel recommends that this Committee be abolished and removed from the bylaws.*

The Standing Committee on the Public Interest has not met in the last four years and its originally envisaged function seems to be accomplished by public member participation on the Board and the Recognition Committee.

The Assemblies:

It seems clear that the more serious structural problems relate to the Assemblies. Their importance is evident. They form an integral part of the Council. They serve as a forum for discussion of common concerns by the Specialized Accrediting Bodies through ASAB and the Institutional Accrediting Bodies through AIAB. The situation is somewhat less clear with ANPEO although the institutions as represented through their national higher education organizations share many common concerns with ASAB and AIAB. All three Assemblies play a crucial part in the policy development process.

However, there are some problems indigenous to AIAB and considerably more serious problems indigenous to ANPEO.

Recommendation 16. *The Panel recommends that the subassemblies, as provided for in the bylaws (9:04), be reinstituted.*

In the 1982 reorganization, provision for meetings of subgroups of Assemblies was included. This was to make it possible for the regional accrediting bodies to continue to meet as a subassembly if they so desired. After 1982, however, the subassembly ceased to meet within the COPA structure and AIAB was continued as a single group. More recently it has become evident that there are continuing issues on which the regional accrediting bodies need to deliberate which are only of peripheral concern to the national institutional accrediting bodies. This has led to informal meetings of the regional directors apart from their COPA involvement. The Advisory Panel believes such meetings should be provided for and take place within the COPA framework and should have the advantage of COPA staff support.

The Panel suggests that the subassembly meetings take place at the time of the COPA semiannual meetings or separately as seems most feasible. The Panel further suggests that in addition to a subassembly meeting for the regional executive directors the national institutional executive directors be encouraged to meet as a subassembly also. Other specialized accrediting bodies that accredit wholly or predominately free-standing specialized institutions where they in effect serve as institutional as well as specialized accrediting bodies may be invited to join with the national institutional group when appropriate to deal with common issues. At this time these could include chiropractic, podiatry, osteopathy, and rabbinic and talmudic studies. Each subassembly could make recommendations to its parent assembly or assemblies and through these to the Board.

Recommendation 17. *The Advisory Panel recommends to the national postsecondary organizations who are members of ANPEO that they continue to urge serious involvement of their presidents and trustees in the activities of their own institutional and specialized accrediting bodies.*

Recommendation 18. *In the light of the different character of ANPEO and its general advisory and policy consideration responsibilities relating to postsecondary educational institutions, the Panel recommends that the name be changed to the Presidents' Policy Panel on Accreditation (PPPA). The Presidents' Policy Panel on Accreditation, as it does now, would elect members (3) to the Board, nominate members for the chief executive at large and the public members of the Board, and nominate members (presidents or persons with presidential experience) to the Recognition Committe. At the Spring or Annual Meeting of COPA, it would convene as a COPA Assembly. Its Fall meeting, however, would be held in conjunction with the American Council on Education meeting where it could serve as a forum for presidential and other association members to discuss accreditation issues for possible referal to the COPA Assemblies and Board agendas.*

ANPEO was created in 1982 to insure presidential and institutional involvement in COPA, not only through the institutional accrediting bodies but also through the primary national organizations to which the institutions belong. Its creation involved moving into the COPA structure what had been the Interassociation Presidents' Committee on Accreditation, a group of the staff

executives plus presidential or institutional representatives, the latter of whom were at that time members of the COPA Board. It was (as were the other assemblies) given considerable latitude to develop its own agenda and procedures. It has at times contributed substantially to the Council through developing a policy agenda. It has more recently experienced problems in attendance and agenda development and has even lost a member organization ostensibly on the grounds of fiscal stringency and inability to pay its dues.

It is critically important that the presidents and institutional officials through their national organizations be directly involved in the affairs of the Council, provide their continuing perspective to the Council's deliberations, and accept responsibility in the total self-regulatory structure of accreditation in this country.

The organizational membership and financial responsibilities of the newly renamed Presidents' Policy Panel on Accreditation would remain essentially the same. As does the present Assembly, it could expand its membership to include other organizations on its own initiative subject to Board approval. The constituent individual members would include a presidential or trustee representative plus the staff executive officer of each of the member national organizations.

The Presidents' Policy Panel on Accreditation would be represented at the Fall meeting of the Assemblies and COPA Board by its officers through participation in the meetings of the officers of the Assemblies. This would enable these officers to inform the meeting of PPPA at the ACE meeting of any recent developments.

Meeting Schedules:

The various Panel recommendations on governance and structure clearly have implications for calendar and meeting schedules. Accordingly, the Advisory Panel recommends the following calendar items for consideration:

Recommendation 19.

1. *COPA Board: Two meetings per year (Spring and Fall). The Spring meeting will be designated the Annual meeting.*

2. *Assemblies:*

   a. *All three assemblies (AIAB, ASAB, PPPA) will meet at the time of the Spring or Annual meeting of the Board.*
   b. *PPPA will hold a second meeting in conjunction with the ACE meeting in the fall.*
   c. *AIAB and ASAB will meet with the Board in the fall unless agenda items are not sufficiently pressing to require such a meeting.*
   d. *Each Assembly including PPPA will delegate to its officers the power to act on its behalf between Assembly meetings. This group plus the President and the Chairman of the Board will meet at the time of the Fall Board meeting to review policy statements and transact any business for the Assemblies.*

e. *The subassemblies may meet either at the time of the regular Assembly meetings (Spring or Annual meeting), at the Fall meeting of the Board, or at such other times and places as they may decide in cooperation with COPA staff.*

3. *Professional Development: The Professional Development program will be held in conjunction with the Annual meeting of the Board and Assemblies in the spring. Additional sessions as called for may be held in conjunction with the Fall Board meeting or regional meetings of accrediting body representatives.*

4. *Recognition Committee: Beginning in the spring, 1987 the Committee on Recognition will meet prior to the semiannual meetings. The intent is to move eventually to a six-month review cycle whereby the Committee on Recognition would meet midway between the Board meetings. This will allow the accrediting bodies under review to respond to the Committee on Recognition recommendations prior to Board action without undue delay such as that which occurs under the current cycle. The Panel approves of this separation of schedules and recommends its continuance.*

V. FINANCES

The issue of the method of financing COPA has been a matter of continuing discussion and concern since the formation of COPA in 1975. While no one has quite defined what would constitute an equitable dues structure, the question of equity continues to be raised. What does seem clear to the Panel is that regardless of the formula or way in which dues are collected, the ultimate source of by far the largest portion of the dues is the postsecondary educational institutions themselves.

Funds for COPA from the institutions come through at least three tracks. The first and largest track is through dues and fees paid to the institutional accrediting bodies. Currently approximately 65% of the dues come from this source—42% from the regionals and 23% from the national institutional accrediting bodies.

The second track is through the specialized accrediting bodies, which currently provide approximately 28% of the dues. Here, however, the picture is more complex. Some, perhaps the largest portion, of the funds come from postsecondary institutions via programs. However, a number of programs, particularly in health and health related fields, are located in other than postsecondary educational institutions, e.g., hospitals and health care centers. Further, in a number of fields major portions of the costs of accreditation are carried not by higher educational institutions but by professionals and practitioners in the field. Thus, for example, in six fields 100% of the costs of accreditation are supported by the sponsoring professional association or associations. In another five fields the professional associations carry 75% or more of the costs.

The third avenue or track of COPA dues is through the national higher educational organizations that are part of ANPEO. These funds constitute only approximately 9% of the dues but come as in the first track from institutions through their national organizations.

It is thus the institutions and programs who primarily support COPA and for whose benefit both accreditation and COPA exist. In future discussions of equity and responsibility this fact should be kept in sight.

The Panel seriously explored a series of alternatives for financing including direct institutional billing. It found that for the reasons cited by the ad hoc finance committee of 1982 such direct institutional assessment is no more feasible now than it was at that time.

These reasons include (1) the difficulty and costs of billing and collecting from all the accredited institutions in the United States, (2) the lack of sanctions by COPA in relation to institutions who refuse to pay, (3) the recognition that without sanctions (as was the case with the National Commission on Accrediting) a portion of the higher education community would provide a free ride to the non-paying institutions thus creating even greater inequities, (4) the inability to forecast income on a voluntary system of

payment, and (5) the fact that those programs not in higher education institutions would pay little, if any, of their share of the costs.

The Panel also considered the "parity plan" of 1980, whereby institutional and specialized accrediting bodies would contribute equal amounts (45% each) in dues to COPA. It found that this position was based on a series of assumptions for which the Panel could find no supporting evidence, for example, that the costs of accreditation nationally are equally divided between institutional and specialized accrediting bodies.

Other alternatives, such as developing an endowment or including a pro rata surcharge on institutional and program dues to accrediting bodies were also reviewed. Each had major problems or disadvantages.

While there appear to be problems with the current dues assessment system, on the whole it seems to work reasonably well. Although there have been a few accrediting bodies that have requested and been granted temporary adjustments with delayed full payment, apart from one national higher education organization there have been no defaults. Accordingly, the Panel does not believe that major revision in dues structure is necessary at this time.

Recommendation 20. *The Advisory Panel recommends that the current system of dues assessment be continued for the period ahead but that it be carefully monitored for possible modifications in the light of changing postsecondary education economic and academic conditions.*

The Advisory Panel, however, calls attention to two critically important aspects of the system that relate to the perceived integrity of the Council on the one hand and to operational balance on the other.

Recommendation 21. *Given the present dues structure the Panel strongly recommends that the Board continue its policy in relation to invested funds and use of earnings on interest as it relates to the general fund balance.* This calls for maintaining a general fund balance of not less than 50% nor more than 100% of the fiscal year operating budget. Only by continuing such a policy can the Council's autonomy in reaching objective decisions in the recognition process in relation particularly to those member accrediting bodies with proportionately larger dues be preserved and defended. In addition as a matter of sound fiscal policy such a general fund balance provides an important protection against other financial crises.

The Panel suggests that realistically the current formula for proportionate amounts of dues--whereby institutional accrediting bodies are expected to pay 60%, specialized accrediting bodies 30% and national postsecondary organizations 10%--may have to be considered a guideline and not a fixed formula. As has happened within the last two years, the shift of an accrediting body from ASAB to AIAB or the withdrawal, loss, or gaining recognition can and does shift the proportionate amounts of dues paid by Assemblies or sectors.

VI. A POSTSCRIPT FOR THE FUTURE

In the preceding pages we have stated our views and recommendations on the current system of accreditation and the workings of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. That, in a formal sense, discharges our narrower responsibility to answer the questions we were asked to address as a self-study Panel taking an "internal" look at the current machinery of accreditation. Indeed, virtually all of us on the Panel are, one way or another, higher education "insiders," and therefore both advantaged and disadvantaged as persons who understand the workings, the complexities, and the politics that are the environment within which the system of accreditation of higher education operates in 1986.

We make no apology for our perspectives and backgrounds; indeed, we hope they have been useful in our assignment. But we feel compelled to add a postscript to our deliberations that speaks to the future. Our compulsion is motivated by our deep commitment to seeing American higher education improve to meet the tough challenges of the future. And this improvement, we are convinced, can and must be linked to the future role of accreditation in our system of postsecondary education.

Because we have some understanding of the complexities and workings of accreditation, we appreciate--and hope all concerned citizens appreciate--the difficult and time-consuming nature of the process of accreditation. It is a complicated and important endeavor. It is also an endeavor that faces new and demanding challenges, for American higher education is faced with an insistent national challenge to improve its quality while retaining its historic commitment to access and openness.

We are convinced that our American system of voluntary accreditation must work creatively to handle additional burdens and responsibilities within our system of higher education. As specific accreditation issues are faced, and as the various reports analyzing and prescribing for American higher education come and go, we expect that the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation will continue to go about its work. Its work has been, and will continue to be, useful in many practical and often unpublicized ways.

But we believe that the future agenda for the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the accreditation and higher education community must be a bolder one, one that speaks to the large public questions involving the challenges of improved quality and performance in our colleges and universities. We believe that all of the leading participants in the processes of accreditation, in our national higher education associations, and in our colleges and universities must work together to strengthen the quality of our teaching programs by making accreditation a vehicle for educational improvement.

Our postscript for the future, therefore, is that the role and mission of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation must now begin to change. It should increasingly focus, in intimate collaboration with the nation's accrediting agencies and its colleges and universities, on stimulating dialogue and providing the kind of leadership that can make accreditation a positive instrument for assuring the quality education essential to our nation's future.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Peter Magrath, Chair
Paul Albrecht
E.K. Fretwell, Jr.
Ann Ida Gannon, BDM
Robert Glidden
John Rhodes Haverty
Paul C. Reinert, SJ
Arliss Roaden
Robert W. Scott

APPENDICES

I. Persons Submitting Written Testimony

II. Summary of Written Testimony

III. Speakers List: Oral Testimony

IV. Summary of Oral Testimony

V. Research and Development in Accreditation (Background for Recommendation 8).

VI. Suggested Changes in Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws

- A. General
- B. Executive Committee
- C. Nominating Committee
- D. Committee on Professional Development
- E. Committee on State Relations

VII. Acronyms

APPENDIX I

Persons Submitting Written Testimony
to the Self-Study Advisory Panel

1. Kay J. Andersen, Executive Director, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges
2. Robert H. Atwell, President, American Council on Education, Chair, Association of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations
3. Charles J. Austin, President, East Texas State University, Member, Assembly of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations representing the American Association of State Colleges and Universities
4. Nancy R. Axelrod, Vice President for Programs in Public Policy and Samuel Silverman, Former Chairman, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Assembly of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations
5. James Ballowe, Chair, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
6. Randall Bell, Executive Director, American Association of Bible Colleges, Secretary, Assembly of Institutional Accrediting Bodies
7. W. Lee Burge, Chairman, Equifax, Inc., Public member, COPA Board
8. J. Douglas Conner, Executive Director, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
9. L. M. Detmer, Secretary, Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs for Physician Assistants (CAHEA)
10. Mildred J. Engle, Vice President/Academic Dean, Pennsylvania College of Straight Chiropractic, President, Straight Chiropractic Academic Standards Association
11. John J. Fauser, Director, Division of Allied Health Education and Accreditation, American Medical Association (CAHEA)
12. Bernard Fryshman, Executive Director, Accreditation Commission, Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools
13. Samuel Hope, Executive Director, National Association of Schools of Music and National Association of Schools of Art and Design
14. William K. Laidlaw, Executive Vice President, American Assocation of Collegiate Schools of Business, Chair, Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies
15. Paul D. Nelson, Director, Office of Accreditation, American Psychological Association
16. Dale Parnell, President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
17. Robert M. O'Neil, President, University of Virginia, Member, COPA Board
18. Allan W. Ostar, President, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Member, Assembly of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations
19. James. T. Rogers, Executive Director, Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
20. J. R. Schofield, Secretary, Liaison Committee on Medical Education, Association of American Medical Colleges

APPENDIX II

Summary of Written Testimonials
for the COPA Self-Study Advisory Panel

POSITIVE OBSERVATIONS

In written testimony, a number of factors were mentioned as specific strengths of COPA. The professional staff was seen to be particularly effective in carrying out the objectives which emerged from the previous self-study. For instance, service to accrediting bodies in the form of professional development, guidance in the recognition process, and support services regarding accreditation were cited. Research and the development of policy papers, preparing publications, and information dissemination were noted as well as the professional staff role in promoting and maintaining positive federal governmental relations. Other favorable notices not as frequently mentioned included the appropriateness of the structure of COPA, the providing of a forum for discussion of diverse viewpoints, and the seeking of external funding for projects.

ISSUES, AREAS OF CONCERN, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Most writers noted that COPA has been successful in meeting its objectives especially in the past five years but offered suggestions for further improvements. In some cases specific recommendations were made, and in other instances topics to be addressed by the panel were identified. The major topics were finance, governance and structure, and policies, priorities, and objectives.

Finance

The most frequently mentioned concern about finance related to perceived inequities in the dues structure. It was suggested that dues be equalized and that dues assessments be related to benefits, i.e., provide more services to higher dues paying members (Andersen). Charging annual fees directly to institutions (Atwell) was another suggestion as well as seeking external funding for special tasks or projects and for building a permanent endowment (Ballowe). One person stated that while he did not oppose, he had reservations about building a reserve fund of over 50% of the annual budget (Atwell).

Regarding expenditures, the following recommendations were made: reduce expenditures (Burge); include only modest inflationary cost adjustments in projected expenditures (Schofield); limit services to monitoring and publications (Rogers); consider adjusting size and type of COPA staff (Andersen); limit Board meetings to one per year held in Washington in alternating years (Schofield); use teleconferencing to conduct executive committee business (Schofield); and avoid duplication of work of the assemblies (Schofield).

An area identified as an excessive expenditure for accrediting bodies was the cost of five-year reviews. It was suggested, instead, that after initial recognition, the accrediting bodies be evaluated every ten years for continuing accreditation with an annual two-page report to be submitted for monitoring purposes (Schofield).

Except for the dues issue, each item was mentioned once.

Governance and structure

A sense of dissatisfaction with the current structure was found in a number of the testimonials. Such concerns focused on insufficient communication among assemblies. There was also, particularly from ANPEO representatives, a concern about the need for increased participation of institutional presidents. Though specifics were not given, suggested changes included revising the meeting format (Laidlaw), creating a new governance structure (Rogers), promoting better understanding among the Assemblies (Axelrod and Silberman), nominating presidents to represent ANPEO on the Committee on Recognition (Austin), assuring presidential control of the Board (Atwell), and developing a means to ensure representation of national institutional accrediting agencies on appropriate decision making bodies (Bell). The intent of these changes is to provide a forum for sharing common problems and interests, to develop more effective linkages among the assemblies, to reduce overlaps (Axelrod and Silberman), and to bring a more university-wide perspective to specialized accreditation (Austin). It was also suggested that the Assemblies meet once a year to discuss business related to the Board and meet separately if additional meetings are necessary (Andersen). To "ensure a national accrediting system that uses regional agencies," it was suggested that staff assignments be revised to provide more service to the regionals in the formulation of common policy positions (Ballowe).

Policies, priorities, and objectives

The perceived roles and functions of COPA have a direct influence on the substance of the written testimonies in relation to the development of policies, priorities, and objectives. It was stated that COPA should continue to influence deeper thinking about accreditation, monitor the federal government on issues of accreditation, and disseminate information about accreditation. The following suggestions, both general and specific, were made related to the COPA roles (1) as the developer of national accreditation policy, (2) as the monitor of accreditation issues, and (3) as the national voice for accreditation.

- Influencing accreditation—COPA should focus primarily on quality improvement and outcomes (Burge); it should continue to provide a forum where accrediting bodies can share information (Burge); COPA should be supported as the appropriate vehicle for recognition (Rogers); opportunities should be provided for input in developing policies which may affect the accreditation community (Rogers); flexibility should be encouraged to support the needs of special projects (Andersen) such as evaluation of education programs at military installations and accreditation of foreign institutions; COPA should move to promote accreditation as a stimulus for improvement (Ballowe); it should facilitate research on accreditation (Schofield) and devise a program to communicate the values of accreditation to leaders of society and the public (Schofield); COPA should assume a more substantive role in addressing troublesome issues such as the prescriptive nature of some curriculum standards (O'Neil); COPA should lead in the development of national policies and strengthen its relationship with the federal government (O'Neil); and it should attend to institutional quality issues working toward comparable standards within and across regional lines (Atwell) and stem the proliferation of accrediting bodies (Laidlaw).

- Monitoring—COPA should continue to observe activities of the federal and state governments with particular attention (1) to the Division of Eligibility and Agency Evaluation, (2) to proposed legislation, and (3) to new regulations (Schofield); COPA should restrict the overlap of jurisdictions among accrediting bodies (Laidlaw); COPA should include the monitoring function in its stated objectives, providing information that may affect the accrediting community and providing opportunities for input into these developments (Rogers).

- Disseminating information—COPA should provide information through publications and newsletters and disseminate information on legislation and research on accreditation (Rogers); COPA should promote information exchange and speak to the issue of defending the autonomy of accreditation processes and defending the institutions against encroachment by the government or other bodies outside the voluntary accreditation community (Rogers).

Other comments of a general nature addressed the formulation of clear, sharply focused objectives (Anderson), policies to encourage regional accrediting bodies to apply their standards rigorously especially for initial accreditation (Laidlaw), and means by which problems identified by presidents could be resolved, the recognition of institutional diversity, for example (Atwell). Specific suggestions to the panel included using a survey in the self-study process (Anderson), building assembly agendas which allow for the annual discussion of priorities (Fryshman), changing recognition cycles (Anderson), and allowing variance in meeting recognition provisions depending on the size and type of accrediting agency (Detmer).

APPENDIX III

Speakers List
Public Hearings
COPA Self-Study Advisory Panel
June 30 - July 1, 1986

Mildred J. Engle, President, Straight Chiropractic Academic Standards Association (SCASA)

Hoke L. Smith, President, Towson State University, Chair, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)

C. Ronald Kimberling, Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

Gordon K. Davies, Director, State Council of Higher Education, Virginia, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

James M. Phillips (Vice Chair, AIAB), Executive Director, Association of Independent Colleges and Schools (AICS)

William K. Laidlaw (Chair, ASAB and Member Ex Officio, COPA Board), Executive Vice President, American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)

Robert Kirkwood (Chair, AIAB and Member Ex Officio, COPA Board), Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

Jeannette Taylor, Chair, Committee Liaison for Accreditation and Standards in Continuing Education (CLASCE), National University Continuing Education Association (NUCEA), Dean, Division of Continuing Education, University of Cincinnati

Hilton T. Bonniwell, President, National University Continuing Education Association (NUCEA)

Robert M. O'Neil (Member At-Large, COPA Board), President, University of Virginia

APPENDIX IV

Summary of Oral Testimony
for the COPA Self-Study Advisory Panel

Mildred J. Engle, President, Straight Chiropractic Academic Standards Association (SCASA)

Dr. Engle's testimony centered on the assumptions that (1) COPA does not adhere to its own guidelines in recognition matters, (2) COPA has not developed a procedure for hearing complaints, and (3) COPA does not have a mechanism to ensure that its guidelines are monitored. Specifically, Dr. Engle made reference to the Council on Chiropractic Education and her belief that the accrediting body does not embrace the full community of interests since it does not include the straight chiropractic profession within its scope. She suggested that COPA appoint a special internal review panel to deal with claims against accrediting bodies.

Hoke L. Smith, President, Towson State University, Chair, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)

Dr. Smith spoke to the value of accreditation in the preservation of decentralization of control and intellectual freedom. He suggested several priority issues to which COPA should address itself: (1) the institutional accrediting process by the regional associations should be strengthened in the area of qualitative evaluation, ie., institutional evaluation should take into account the full range of educational goals as defined by the institution, and accrediting bodies should assess the institution's assessment system in relation to its goals; (2) the nature of the accreditation process is developmental, and results of reports should not be selectively released; rather, some method should be developed to address the public interest while the developmental character of accreditation is maintained; (3) efforts to standardize the data base are to be applauded as a means of simplifying the self-study process; (4) in an effort to control costs, efforts should be made by the accrediting bodies to hold to a reasonable team size; (5) specialized accrediting bodies should be encouraged to protect institutional integrity and balance and restrain self-serving tendencies; (6) specialized accrediting bodies should recognize differences between research institutions and state supported colleges and universities in terms of autonomy, salaries, and working conditions and take these differences into consideration; (7) since it is difficult for the general administration or general faculty to control a specialized accrediting body, an oversight function could be developed to allow generalists to comment on standards and the implication of these standards on the institutions.

Dr. Smith referred to written testimony submitted by Allan Ostar, president of AASCU, which he supported. Key elements of Dr. Ostar's paper refer to the continued support of AASCU for COPA and a call for COPA to strengthen its efforts in these ways: continue to challenge overly specific quantitative standards; assure that accrediting bodies focus on effectiveness, results, and outcomes; help encourage institutional freedom and autonomy; prevent the recognition of unnecessary or duplicative accrediting bodies; encourage the

relevance of the arts and sciences to professional education; ensure that accrediting bodies are not misused to promote special interests; strengthen the role of accreditation in relation to state concerns about educational quality; and clarify with the states the relationships among accreditation, licensure, and certification.

C. Ronald Kimberling, Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

After describing the development of the Division of Eligibility and Agency Evaluation, its role of quality assurance, and its relationship with non-regulatory accrediting bodies, Dr. Kimberling emphasized the need for demonstrable and measurable indicators of quality, consumerist concerns, and public scrutiny of higher education, particularly graduate schools serving foreign students that provide education as a major export product. He stressed the need for student outcome measures, revision of accreditation criteria, and consistency of treatment of an institution among accrediting bodies, that is, promoting reciprocity among peers. Regarding the assessment of quality in the non-traditional delivery of graduate education, Dr. Kimberling suggested that consideration be given to the efficacy of using part-time faculty, the measurement of student outcomes through proficiency standards, the use of institutional resources, means for collecting and disseminating information, and the use of joint reviews and recognition where possible.

Gordon K. Davies, Director, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

Dr. Davies suggested ways that accrediting bodies could be allies of state higher education agencies in planning and coordination. For instance, in response to the push by governors and legislatures, accrediting bodies could join with state higher education agencies in defining appropriate criteria for student assessment, in documenting needs for equipment and maintenance, in limiting degree escalation and degree inflation, in coordinating accreditation activities among various bodies to reduce the number of visits and related costs, and in anticipating new opportunities, issues, problems and solutions in the accrediting community. In the discussion following testimony, interest was expressed by panel members in developing a COPA policy statement advocating greater state higher education agency involvement in accreditation activities and identifying areas to be considered for cooperation including, perhaps, the coordination of licensure of institutions and the appropriate use of veterans benefits.

James M. Phillips (Vice Chair, AIAB), Executive Director, Association of Independent Colleges and Schools (AICS)

Recommendations to the panel made by Dr. Phillips were suggestions to strengthen the intent of COPA's stated objectives. For instance, he recommended that since there will be a greater need for strong COPA-governmental relations, as a spokesperson for accreditation, COPA should include within this objective relations at the state level as well as the

federal level. Relative to this role, COPA should be empowered to speak for all accrediting bodies when current legislative developments require an accreditation position. A second recommendation revolved around the need to improve coordination and cooperation among COPA constituencies. This would require a change of structure to assure that the Board includes representation of private, independent institutional accrediting bodies. Another related matter is the coordination of dues collection in those cases where an institution is accredited by more than one body. Regarding the service to the broader interests of the educational community and society, Dr. Phillips suggested that the panel instruct COPA to insist strongly that its affiliated accrediting bodies pay greater attention to student consumer protection at the institutions they accredit.

William K. Laidlaw (Chair, ASAB and Member Ex Officio, COPA Board), Executive Vice President, American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)

In his testimony, Dr. Laidlaw addressed difficulties of long duration within COPA which deserve attention from the panel. The proliferation of accrediting bodies leads to problems of overlapping jurisdiction which may inadvertently encourage institutions to seek accreditation from bodies offering the "path of least resistance." In order to emphasize educational effectiveness, regional accrediting bodies should be discouraged from accrediting institutions of marginal quality. This problem, left unchecked, could lead governmental agencies to assume greater influence over accreditation. Greater attention should be given to the development of outcome measures, that is, instruments to assess knowledge of skills to be retained and measures of attitudes relative to the profession. COPA should work to create environments conducive to the use of outcome measures to evaluate results of educational programs. Lastly, a meeting format should be devised to improve communication by providing sufficient opportunities for interchange between representatives of the assemblies.

Robert Kirkwood (Chair, AIAB and Member Ex Officio, COPA Board), Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

Dr. Kirkwood addressed as a persistent problem the lack of understanding and awareness of accreditation both inside and outside educational institutions. He suggested that COPA should be communicating about the diversity which characterizes American higher education, the importance of self-regulation, and the primary interest of accreditation in institutional improvement. Dr. Kirkwood suggested several areas for improvement of COPA which should be considered by the panel: the meeting schedule should be modified to foster improved communication for those accrediting bodies with common interests and concerns and among the Assemblies; a reassessment of funding of COPA should be considered with the intent of developing a more equitable funding formula; the question of common and uncommon interests of the AIAB should be considered along with a plan to permit meetings of accrediting bodies in subgroups; and the recognition cycle should be reconsidered, perhaps a ten-year cycle with an interim report in the fifth year. Regarding the influence of COPA, Dr. Kirkwood expressed a desire for steadily rising expectations and a need to keep accreditation current and on the cutting edge of educational improvement.

Jeannette Taylor, Chair, Committee Liaison for Accreditation and Standards in Continuing Education (CLASCE), National University Continuing Education Association (NUCEA), Dean, Division of Continuing Education, University of Cincinnati

Dr. Taylor introduced NUCEA president Hilton T. Bonniwell who testified on behalf of NUCEA. He expressed a concern over the lack of attention to quality issues relative to continuing education in the overall evaluation and accreditation of postsecondary institutions. Dr. Bonniwell's concerns arise from the rapid growth of continuing education, the increase in numbers of part-time students, the greater age range of postsecondary students, and increasing need for consumer protection. He stated that at the present time there is inadequate review of continuing education, and in many cases institutional accreditation does not assure the presence of quality of continuing education in that this area is not reviewed carefully, and the relationships between continuing education and other programs within the institution are not adequately evaluated. He urged the panel members to consider four recommendations to improve regional and specialized accreditation on behalf of continuing education: (1) establish a task force to develop common standards on continuing education that could be adopted by both regional and specialized accrediting bodies; (2) support the development of an adequate pool of evaluators to use newly developed standards; (3) devote increased attention to new formats and educational delivery systems; (4) examine the growth of continuing education in response to increased demands from business and industry. If these recommendations are adopted by COPA, NUCEA pledges its full support and assistance in carrying them out.

Robert M. O'Neil (Member At-Large, COPA Board), President, University of Virginia

In his testimony Tuesday morning, Dr. O'Neil offered several observations about COPA which he believes to be pertinent to the work of the panel.

1. Accreditation is at the core of the institutions' claims of credibility as reflected in their ability to assess and regulate themselves.
2. Accreditation must be coordinated at the national level particularly in relation to the role of the federal government in the accrediting process; and of great importance is the establishment of a single set of national standards and norms for institutional accreditation. Thus, if there were no COPA, something like it would have to be invented.
3. The balance of power among the constituencies of COPA is a legitimate concern. Modifications of the structure to provide a greater voice for some groups might be warranted. Perhaps liaison groups could improve communication among the Assemblies. Regarding the voice of the presidents, the problem may lie as much with under-involvement as with under-representation. Perhaps a crisis in accreditation of the magnitude of the crisis in intercollegiate athletics is necessary to force presidents to focus the time and energy needed for change.
4. The potential for COPA's role in accreditation has not yet been fully tapped; COPA could assume a more substantive role in its standards of recognition. Perhaps, for example, more attention can be given to the baccalaureate curriculum and to the assurance of academic freedom and affirmative action.

5. The development of national policies which supplement the review and recognition process is an indispensable role of COPA. Relationships with the federal government and with accrediting bodies provides a vital link for information exchange.

In response to questions from the panel, Dr. O'Neil suggested that instead of national standards there could be comparability in addressing various topics, for example, the assessment of institutions offering instruction in regions other than their own. Regarding student outcomes assessments, Dr. O'Neil perceived this as important to establish accountability but not to prescribe instruments or acceptable scores. A panel member suggested a conference or task force on outcomes, their appropriate measures, and what outcomes assessment can and cannot do which might involve representatives of COPA, Educational Testing Service (ETS), and SHEEO. In response to a question about presidential involvement, Dr. O'Neil suggested task forces, an advisory group of presidents, scheduling the ANPEO meeting at the ACE meeting, recognition activities, and evaluation responsibilities; he suggested that retired presidents might be able to contribute more time.

APPENDIX V

Research and Development in Accreditation
(Background Material for Recommendation 8)

To advance the state of the art in accreditation, COPA should initiate and provide leadership and administrative support to a Research and Development function drawing on resources, skills, and tested practices in the accrediting community for the solution of problems which cut across institutional and specialized accreditation boundaries. This endeavor should be conducted for a three-year experimental period and then reviewed. One possible format is the following.

A small set of Task Forces, perhaps two, should be formed each year to function for a year. Each Task Force should be directed to a specific topic and should develop a report at the conclusion of that year to be shared with the entire accrediting community. For illustration, topics such as: (1) an assessment and review of outcome measures as indicators of quality in accreditation assessment, or (2) a review of the proper role of standards in the accreditation process. The purpose of each Task Force would be to define the problem in the stated area and to assess and/or develop some alternative solutions. Its purpose would be to do the research and development labor required of an in-depth analysis. It's purpose should in no sense be to attempt to legislate or mandate. COPA would act as initiator, legitimator and "honest broker."

Membership

The membership of the Task Forces would come largely from the regular accreditation community, staff and "volunteers," with an occasional technical expert added. Some special staff support should be provided to each specific Task Force either from COPA or one or the other of the associations.

Task Force Topics

The proposed COPA/ACE conference on accreditation might have as one of its outcomes the designation of such study areas. Conversely, it might receive such reports. Suggested topics for the first year for purposes of illustration might be the following:

1. An assessment and review of outcome measures as indicators of quality in accreditation assessment. This may be the principal technical issue of the 80's. The accreditation community should quickly assume a proactive position on this matter. It should review technical, feasibility, and political aspects of outcome measurement from the standpoint of highly knowledgeable accreditors and provide assessment and recommendations to the entire accreditation community. The latter can then use these findings as it sees fit through its normal mechanisms of deliberation and decision.

2. A review of the proper role of standards in the accreditation process, including in particular issues of optimal specificity, commonality across the span of institutional and specialized accreditation, and the possibility of developing selected core national standards for institutional accreditation.

3. Other possible areas for common research and development attention include such matters as (a) the possible simplification and coordination of the self-study and review process in colleges and universities by institutional and specialized agencies, (b) the relative emphasis on general vs. specialized education in undergraduate study, (c) the assessment of methods for informing institutions and the public about accreditation, and (d) the training and evaluation of accreditors.

Financial Support:

When such a "Research and Development" function is mentioned, the issue of cost arises immediately. Often fund-raising is mentioned as a possible strategy for financial support. While such an approach is possible, it tends to be cumbersome and uncertain. Furthermore, undue delay is almost inevitable. Financial support should rather be provided in the following manner: COPA should re-direct some time and energy to being the "honest broker" and provide some special Task Force staff support; other accrediting bodies might provide Task Force staff support as well; Task Force members either from agencies or universities and colleges should donate their time; the agencies or universities and colleges from which the individual Task Force members came should provide travel expense support; COPA should prepare and duplicate the report. These support mechanisms may involve a somewhat different approach; they seem feasible enough to merit a try. Much is at stake for the entire accreditation community including its college and university members.

APPENDIX VI

Suggested Changes in Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws Language

A. General

If recommendations of the panel are adopted by the Board, a number of changes in the Articles of Incorporation and the Bylaws will be necessary. Places where those changes will occur are cited below.

Page Number	Proposed Change or Addition
Articles of Amendment to the Articles of Incorporation	
New pages following page 6	Add amendments to Article THIRD Purposes and Article FOURTH Members.
Bylaws	
4 and 5	Revise Article II, Purposes.
5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20	Change name of Assembly of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations.
8	Delete or chief academic officers.
13	Change fall to spring, item 1 and revise language.
14	Change voting rights for ex officio members.
15	Change Section 6:01 to reflect new composition of Executive Committee.
17 and 18	Delete Article VII, Sections 7:01-7:05, Committee on the Public Interest.
Following page 20	Add new language and Articles creating three standing committees - the Nominating Committee, the Committee on State Relations, and the Committee on Professional Development. Change the numbers of subsequent Article.
22	Add new item, the power to delegate to its officers.
25	Revise Section 9:04, Meetings, item 1 -- change fall to spring, add statements relative to fall meetings.
25	Add to Section 9:04, Officers Meetings, new item 4.
26	Change item 4 to item 5.

B. Executive Committee

ARTICLE VI
Executive Committee

Sec. 6:01. Membership, Election, and Terms of Office.

There shall be an Executive Committee of the Board composed of six members to include the Chairman of the Board, Chairman-Elect in election years, Past Chairman in alternate years, Treasurer, Chairman of the Committee on Recognition, and a Member At-Large, each as voting members, and the Secretary as a non-voting member. The Chairman, Chairman-Elect, Past Chairman, and Treasurer shall serve concurrently with the terms of their respective offices. The Chairman of the Committee on Recognition and the Member At-Large shall be elected in the same year for two year terms from among the members of the Board. The Secretary shall be the President of the Council.

C. Nominating Committee

ARTICLE VII
Nominating Committee

Sec. .01. Membership, Appointment, and Terms of Office.
There shall be a Nominating Committee composed of at least three members, appointed by the Chairman of the Board. The Chairman of the Committee shall be a member of the Board; other members may be selected from outside Board membership. The Chairman and other members of the Nominating Committee shall serve for one year and shall be eligible for reappointment. They shall take office on July 1 following their appointment.

Sec. .02. Duties.
The Nominating Committee shall have responsibility for selecting and placing before the Board for election persons qualified for the following positions:

Board members from among chief executive officers of accredited institutions;
Board members to represent the public;
Officers of the Board, including chairman-elect, treasurer, and member at-large of the Executive Committee;
Members of the Committee on Recognition; and
Chairman of the Committee on Recognition.

Sec. .03. Meetings.
The Nominating Committee shall meet at least annually and at other times as may be necessary.

Sec. .04. Reporting.
The Nominating Committee shall report to the Board annually at the Annual Meeting or at any other meeting during which elections are to be held.

Sec. .05. Compensation.
Members of the Nominating Committee shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be reimbursed for travel and other necessary expenses incurred in fulfilling their duties as Committee members.

D. Committee on Professional Development

New ARTICLE VIII
Committee on Professional Development

Sec. :01. Membership, Appointment and Terms of Office.

There shall be a six member Professional Development Committee composed of the Vice Chairs of the Assembly of Institutional Accrediting Bodies and the Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies, and two representatives of the Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies, one of the Assembly of Institutional Accrediting Bodies and one of the President's Policy Panel on Accreditation appointed by the Chairman of the Board. The Chair shall rotate annually between the Vice Chairs of the Assembly of Institutional Accrediting Bodies and the Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies. Members of the Committee shall serve for two years and shall be eligible for reappointment for one additional term. They shall take office on July 1 following their appointment.

Sec. :02. Duties.

The Professional Development Committee shall be responsible for the general planning of those activities which will enhance the development of accreditation association staff. The Committee shall advise the Board on matters of professional development and shall be responsible for specific duties assigned by the Board.

Sec. :03. Meetings.

The Professional Development Committee shall meet at least semiannually and at such other times as may become necessary.

Sec. :04. Reporting.

The Professional Development Committee shall report to the Board at each of the Board's annual meetings and at other regular or special Board meetings as may become necessary.

Sec. :05. Compensation.

Members of the Professional Development Committee shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be reimbursed for travel and other necessary expenses incurred in fulfilling their duties as Committee members.

E. Committee on State Relations

New ARTICLE IX
Committee on State Relations

Sec. :01. Membership, Appointments, and Terms of Office.

There shall be a Committee on State Relations composed of five members appointed by the Chairman of the Board. Members of the Committee shall serve staggered two-year terms and shall be eligible for reappointment to one additional term. They shall take office on July 1 following their appointment.

Sec. :02. Duties.

The Committee on State Relations shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Board, and in this role it may recommend items for the agenda of the Board or the Executive Committee. The Committee shall be responsible for helping to formulate the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation policy as it relates to states and to state agencies. It shall serve when and if appropriate as the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation constituency of a joint Council on Postsecondary Accreditation/State Higher Education Executive Officers Liaison Committee, to address common interests of both the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers including, but not limited to, issues related to quality improvement and enhancement of postsecondary education.

Sec. :03. Meetings.

The Committee on State Relations shall meet at least annually and as may become necessary. A majority of the membership of the committee shall constitute a quorum. The Committee shall also meet at least annually and as may become necessary with the State Higher Education Executive Officers constituency of a joint liaison committee.

Sec. :04. Reporting.

The Committee on State Relations shall report to the Board at each of the Board's annual meetings and at other regular or special Board meetings as may become necessary.

Sec. :05. Compensation.

Except for the President, Committee members shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for travel and other necessary expenses incurred in fulfilling their duties as Committee members.

APPENDIX VII

Glossary of Acronyms Used

Constituent Units:

COPA	Council on Postsecondary Accreditation
AIAB	Assembly of Institutional Accrediting Bodies
ANPEO	Assembly of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations
ASAB	Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies
PPPA	Presidents' Policy Panel on Accreditation

National Organizations:

AACSB	American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
AASCU	American Association of State Colleges and Universities
ACE	American Council on Education
AICS	Association of Independent Colleges and Schools
CAHEA	Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation
CLASCE	Committee on Liaison for Accreditation and Standards in Continuing Education
ETS	Educational Testing Service
NUCEA	National University Continuing Education Association
SCASA	Straight Chiropractic Academic Standards Association
SHEEO	State Higher Education Executive Officers Association